

advice to the ERPP and thus indirectly to the Roundtable. The Roundtable will focus on setting priorities for implementation of near-term projects that help meet the long-term ERPP goals. A primary difference between this Work Group and the Roundtable is that this Work Group is looking at goals, objectives, and targets. The Roundtable is looking at specific actions to make sure they meet the targets and goals. The Roundtable can also provide input on how to integrate CALFED and the CVPIA restoration efforts. In addition, the Roundtable will provide advice to the CALFED Management Team regarding the use of \$60 million appropriate under Proposition 204. This money is already part of existing commitments and the Roundtable is working to ensure that projects implemented work in the direction of where the overall CALFED approach wants to go.

A question was raised regarding the role the Roundtable is playing in the appropriations of federal funds, approved as part of the passage of Proposition 204. It was stated that the Roundtable's setting of priorities will influence the appropriations but that the Roundtable is not directly involved in lobbying for any particular outcome. The lobbying is being left to the stakeholder groups. There is a need, it was expressed, to make sure federal appropriation efforts do not get ahead of the CALFED process, that appropriations should not become project specific at this time. Project specific appropriations might hurt the appropriation of any funding.

A question was also raised as to how CEQA/NEPA compliance will be satisfied by the projects being approved by the Roundtable. Cindy made it clear that each project proponent will be responsible for preparing necessary environmental documentation. Some wondered if the Roundtable would act as a clearinghouse for this documentation. It was stated that this is not envisioned as a role of the Roundtable and documents would be available through normal public review processes. The Roundtable is also working on permit coordination issues, a key part of facilitating early implementation of projects. The issue of permit coordination is the subject of a CALFED draft proposal that will be available prior to next Work Group meeting and will be an agenda item at the next meeting.

Mary asked Dick Daniels to provide an overview of the ERPP example vision statement. According to Dick, the draft circulated to the Work Group is conceptual in nature and that comments should focus on how well this portrays information rather than commenting on the information contained in this draft. It is proposed that "visions" be individually written for 14 geographic ecological zones as well as for several specific species, habitat types, and stressors. This draft outlines a method envisioned for sorting the ERPP targets into the following categories:

- Targets that have regulatory foundation, sufficient scientific basis, and stakeholder and agency support for quick implementation

- Targets that meet CALFED ecosystem restoration objectives but which need to be implemented on a conservative basis and monitored to determine future implementation levels
- Targets that require scientific substantiation prior to developing levels for implementation

The intent of these categories is to help prioritize and develop implementation strategies for identified targets. This idea of categorizing targets had general support from the Work Group. Although, there was discussion over how prioritization would occur and if the target category definitions were appropriate. The draft discussion paper also includes methods to present ecological processes in the specific ecological zone and discusses how targets in each zone help meet overall objectives. Comments regarding the categorization of targets included:

- CALFED staff may want to use “risk of success” as a measure of determining whether a target will help meet objective goals. This would be an exercise in determining the certainty of actions. However, there may be cases where actions are implemented even if science has not “caught up” and certainty is not well known. In such cases, efforts to split funding sources among research and implementation is necessary. Also, research actions will be listed specifically for some of the targets to help science catch up where needed.
- Actions should be measured against some goal or performance level. To help provide some assurance to stakeholders, work is underway to link actions to objectives by providing reasons. For example, “In order to accomplish increased levels of spring run salmon...by...screening, etc”, with the “by” term linking action to objective.
- Actions and objectives should be kept separate. The process needs to focus on what objectives it wants to accomplish before it categories targets. High levels of stakeholder support should not be used to influence the categorization of targets. This implies that stakeholder support is equivalent to scientific basis. Simply because stakeholders support an idea does not mean that it is scientifically justified or appropriate for our vision. Such viewpoints, though, should be considered during implementation phases.
- How targets are categorized could have significant policy implications. Categorization has the potential to be unifying or divisive, depending on how targets are interpreted and categorized.
- The intent of this approach is to disclose to everyone the perceived level of certainty of how some actions will help meet the objectives. It also is intended to portray the need for adaptive management for those targets placed in the second category.
- The type of targets (qualitative vs. quantitative) will reflect a level of certainty.
- Targets and principles need to promote positive responses in the ecosystem and not strive to reinforce the status-quo.

There was a specific question raised regarding implementation of meanderbelts. Will meanderbelts be allowed to create themselves in an uncontrolled manner? If so, this could go against the efforts of other agencies to protect life and property. Dick responded that

meanderbelts would be controlled such that they only meander in particular areas and in certain natural or leveed barriers. In addition, CALFED does not have the authority to override the decisions of agencies charged with protecting life and property and, furthermore, it is not the intention to create such risks.

With regard to the third bullet on page 5 of the Sacramento River vision, concern was expressed that returning to historic conditions is not always in the best interest of other aspects of the ecosystem that have developed under current conditions. The intent should be to restore natural processes not historic processes.

There were also questions raised regarding the potential of focusing on only a few species and having a restoration plans (visions) that are biased to other species. Dick responded that in most instances, efforts will be made to look at all species and habitats. That is the value of defining geographic ecological zones. However, regulation, such as the Endangered Species Act will force certain species to be highlighted. A suggestion was offered to include "sideboards" that limited the extent of implementation of particular actions. This would reduce the potential negative impact some targets might have upon other targets.

Some members of the Work Group argued for better coordination with other agency experts and technical experts outside of public agencies. There seems to be an opportunity, some felt, to bring in valuable expertise to help draft visions and determine viability of some targets. A request was made to develop a different process to highlight interests or concerns earlier rather than later. Some agency staff requested to be more involved with the development of these visions and categorization of targets. They do not like to simply receive documents and be limited to comments at the document stage.

Dick stated that drafts of all vision statements (currently estimated at 80 total) would be completed prior to the March 10 BDAC meeting. However, there is a lot of work to still be done and this schedule has not been finalized. The purpose for presenting the draft Sacramento River and Chinook Salmon visions at this meeting was to give Work Group members a chance to comment on the conceptual framework of this approach. This will help CALFED staff refine the presentation of the visions prior to starting the others.

After a short break, Dick gave the Work Group an overview of the concept behind the Chinook Salmon vision. It was stated that this vision had been assembled quickly and represents a method of presenting information. Dick requested that the content of the vision not be the focus of Work Group comments but rather asked that the group comment on the concept for presentation.

It was stated by one member that this vision framework is a good. However, it is the vision of one particular group and is subjective to the bias of whomever is drafting the vision. There is concern that inclusion of commercial fisheries harvest as a primary stressor will result in actions

that restrict fishing industry, regardless of whether or not necessary. The concern is that the CALFED effort might make decisions without input by forums that are deeply involved with discussing harvest management. There is a need for better communications between CALFED and such other forums.

This concern was echoed generally by others in that many of the factors listed on page 2 of the salmon vision document are never provided with reasons for their inclusion. Lists like this have the tendency to be brought along through an entire planning effort and end up being the target of actions to curtail their impacts, it was felt. There has never been an effort to define why some things are on this list and why others are not, it was stated. It was further stated that there is a need for making priority decisions regarding what actions have the most benefit and are most feasible. Nothing, it was felt, is being done to allow for discrimination among actions. Dick responded to these concerns by stating that this is a programmatic level analysis and the comparison of specific actions will happen during Phase 3 of CALFED. This was supported with a statement that the decision to implement particular actions should be handled by the Roundtable and that this effort should stay focused at the objective, programmatic level. Dick stated that there is also work being done to provide a "why" with each action listed to accompany the "what" and "how much". Efforts are also underway to coordinate with more technical experts (including the recent round of ecosystem restoration technical workshops).

With regard to coordination with technical experts, Dick referenced work being done by Boating and Waterways Agency to evaluate habitat impact of boating. However, according to one Work Group member who is involved in this effort, the Boating and Waterways Agency is limiting its effort to a survey regarding the need for additional recreational facilities which does not address habitat impacts. Therefore, it was stated, relying on some of the "so-called" experts to provide information is not appropriate. Rather specific needs for information should be identified by CALFED and forwarded to these agencies to investigate. This thought was echoed by another member of the group but in regard to lack of incentives for agencies to research particular issues. There is a tendency to maintain status-quo because there is no incentive to do research on a particular stressor or particular species until a crisis develops (e.g., potential ESA listing for a particular species stimulates more research). There needs to be more effort placed on proactive research and investigations. In addition, too much emphasis placed on the need for scientific basis prior to implementation could act as a disincentive to moving forward.

Some members of the Work Group were concerned with the vast number of visions being proposed. It was felt that too many visions could diminish the power that a typical vision statement would have. It was not being suggested that CALFED staff reduce the amount of information, but rather recast some of the information in a different manner. There was also concern expressed about writing visions for some ecosystem stressors. It was felt that this might unfairly point to particular causes and move people away from focusing on restoration

objectives. It was suggested that text on stressors be rewritten with a positive rather than a negative emphasis.

A suggestion was made to include more references to other programs happening outside of CALFED. Dick responded that a 130 page document has been drafted regarding this and is being reviewed internally. This document will be presented to the Work Group for discussion at their next meeting.

Discussion then turned to the draft appendix also distributed at the beginning of the meeting. This appendix presents how the definition and objectives of each ecological zone will be described. This particular appendix is for the Sacramento River Ecological Zone (14). Discussion by the group was limited to concern over the use of dilution water to help reduce concentrations of pollutants in the Sacramento River. Water user interests maintain that the Bureau of Reclamation has done this in the past and the associated water has not been allowed to be recovered downstream. When not recovered downstream, this water results in economic impacts. Dick commented that the CALFED staff views dilution as a secondary measure for reducing pollutants. Source control would be the primary action.

The next meetings were set for the following dates (last Wednesday of each month):

- January 29, 1997
- February 26, 1997
- March 26, 1997

The January meeting will include discussion and comment on two draft documents:

- a document on integration of CALFED ecosystem vision with existing programs
- a document proposing methods to coordinate permitting of ecosystem restoration activities